

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/650,491	08/28/2003	Charles Kreutzer	62747	6978
27148 7	7590 10/13/2006		EXAMINER	
POLSINELLI SHALTON WELTE SUELTHAUS P.C.			SOOHOO, TONY GLEN	
700 W. 47TH	STREET			
SUITE 1000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112-1802		1723		

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/650,491	KREUTZER, CHA	ARLES
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tony G. Soohoo	1723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a rep within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered time HS from the mailing date of this of NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Au	ugust 2006.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 12,14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the	application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		·	
6) Claim(s) <u>12,14 and 16-21</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by	y the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · · ·	• *	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			* *
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form P	TO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received. s have been received in Ap	plication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eceived in this National	Stage
application from the International Bureau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not re	eceivea.	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mmary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Mail Date prmal Patent Application (PT)	O-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

Application/Control Number: 10/650,491 Page 2

Art Unit: 1723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim interpretation

1. Claim 21 recites a "configured for coupling" is read as directed to the intended environment and is deemed to only require the structural capability of coupling to a source of water. The scope of the claims does not claim a source of pressurized water. For example, a structure with a mere coupling or an open ended pipe line which may fit into a source tank in which may be fluidly coupled in operation is deemed to meet the claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 12, 14, 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otte 5609417 in view of Wellman 3415257 and Carney et al 5427126.

The Otte reference teaches the a device for delivering a chemical fluid including a tank 24 with a cylindrical and conical sections 24a, 24b, a lid to the tank 30, a fluid transfer apparatus to withdrawal the fluid via a pump 28 and valve 52 or 46 to direct the fluid out to a sprayer or hose via a coupling 50 in the discharge line 48, 44.

The Otte reference discloses all of the recited subject matter as defined within the scope of the claims with the exception of having a system for rinsing the tank with a

fluid intake port and dispenser coupled to the cover, and having a controller in electrical communication with the rising system's intake port and pump, and comprising modes for cleaning via the interior of the tank and for directing the pump to discharge the fluid from tank.

With regards to the issue of a rising system, the reference to Wellman and Carney teaches that one may provide a rising system to clean a tank. The Wellman especially shows that one may provide a nozzle through the lid of the tank with an intake port, and a source of aqueous fluid for cleaning.

Accordingly, in view of the teaching and showing of the Wellman and Carney references that one may utilize a rinse system to the tank for cleaning, it is deemed that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for the Otte reference with a system for rinsing the tank with a fluid intake port and dispenser coupled to the cover, so that Otte's tank may be easily cleaned.

With regards to the use of a controller for a cleaning/rising system to a tank, the reference to Carney et al discloses that one may use a controller 72, column 4, lines 8-12 to control the valves and pumps. Furthermore, the use of electrical valves in the control of dispensing fluid from tanks are notoriously old and well known.

Furthermore, in view of the Carney et al reference, and the use of common knowledge of computer control and electrical valves, it is deemed that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for the device provide for the Otte device with a controller to control all features of the rinse/clean, fill, and discharge of the mixture of fluids so that the device is performed automatically so as to reduce the burden of human error. since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art. In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192.

With regards to claim 16, the issue of the use of diaphragm pump. The use of diaphragm pumps are an old and well known class of pump mechanisms such as centripetal or diaphragm or displacement pumps which all pump fluids.

Absent an unexpected result, it is deemed that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the pump of the Otte reference with a diaphragm pump of a known structural functional equivalent so as to provide a more conventionally made device should diaphragm pumps be more readily available than other commonly known pumps.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12, 14, 16-21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McKenzie 4030513, Ray 3236248, and Ruhl 5348058 teaches cleaning systems through the lid of a tank.

Application/Control Number: 10/650,491

Art Unit: 1723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony G. Soohoo whose telephone number is (571) 272 1147. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM, Tue-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1723

TONY G. SOOHOO PRIMARY EXAMINER 1723

Page 5